UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/742,859	12/20/2000	William Phillip Gorman	RD28276	8056

6111 7590 10/19/2004

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
ANDREW C HESS
GE AIRCRAFT ENGINES
ONE NEUMANN WAY M/D H17
CINCINNATI, OH 452156301

EXAMINER	
HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/742,859	GORMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Doug Hutton	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 July 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 December 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 23 July 2004, Applicant amended Claims 1-12 and 14-20, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 23 April 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Faustini, U.S. Patent No. 6,557,164.

Claim 1:

Faustini discloses a method for developing web applications and executing the developed web applications on a computer network (see Figures 4A-D; see Column 59, Line 53 through Column 60, Line 39 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming tool is used to create scripts for web pages), the method comprising the steps of:

- visually generating in a single visual workspace both decision logic for a web application and a visual layout for the web application on a development computer using a plurality of components (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming tool generates: 1) "decision logic" for the web application, in that the code for the application is automatically generated by the programming tool based on the programmer's interactions with the programming tool; and 2) a "visual layout" for the web application in that it displays the actual layout of the application that is developed, as shown in Figure 16; that is, both the "decision logic" and the "visual layout" of the web application are developed by the computer programmer using the object oriented programming tool within the "Project Studio Desktop" window, as shown in Figure 16), the plurality of components comprising:
    - at least one first component type to accomplish a particular function in the web application (see "first components" 1304-1314, 1402-1404, 1502A-1502B and 1604-1606 in Figure 16; each of these components "accomplish a particular function" in the application, as clearly indicated in Column 89, Line 10 through Column 93, Line 25);
    - at least one second component type to arrange the visual layout of the web application (see "second components" 1304-1314, 1402-1404, 1502A-1502B and 1604-1606 in Figure 16; each of these components

"arrange the visual layout" of the application, as clearly indicated in Figure 16); and

- at least one third component type to link together the first component type and the second component type (see "third components" located between first and second components 1304-1314, 1402-1404, 1502A-1502B and 1604-1606 in Figure 16; each of these components "links together" the first and second components);

- transferring the web application to at least one server accessible by users on a computer network (see Column 1, Line 28 through Column 5, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation, as explained in the cited text; additionally, web applications are typically "transferred to a server" so they can be accessed by web users); and
- executing sequentially the components of the web application in response to a request of a user on the computer network for the web application (see Figure 16; see Column 89, Line 10 through Column 99, Line 32 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the web application, displayed in Figure 16, "executes sequentially" in order to display the appropriate Centigrade/Fahrenheit relationship, as explained in the cited figure and text).

Claim 2:

Faustini discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said step of visually generating in a single workspace both decision logic for a web application and a visual layout for the web application includes the steps of:

- opening the visual workspace on the development computer (see Figure 16 – Faustini discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure);
- selecting a component from one of the at least one first component type and the at least one second component type (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that components that either "accomplish particular functions" or "arrange visual layouts" are "selected" by the user and placed into the "Project Studio Desktop" window, as shown in Figure 16);
- inserting the selected component into the visual workspace (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that components are "selected" by the user and "inserted" into the "Project Studio Desktop" window, as shown in Figure 16);
- configuring operation of the inserted component to correspond to a desired operation in the web application (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that object oriented programming tool allows the programmer to edit and configure the inserted components, as clearly indicated in Figure 16 and Column 89, Line 10 through Column 99, Line 32);

- connecting the inserted component to at least one other component in the visual workspace with the at least one third component type (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in Figure 16); and
- repeating the steps of selecting, inserting, configuring and connecting until the web application is generated (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in Figure 16 and Column 89, Line 10 through Column 99, Line 32).

Claim 3:

Faustini discloses the method of Claim 2, wherein said step of visually generating in a single workspace both decision logic for a web application and a visual layout for the web application includes the further steps of:

- creating at least one system variable to store information and communicate the stored information between components (see Figure 16; see Column 94, Lines 20-30 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming system allows the user to create variables that are to be transmitted across connections between objects of the application); and
- using the created at least one system variable with at least one corresponding visual component of the plurality of visual components (see Figure 16; see Column 94, Lines 20-30 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the variables are transmitted across connections between objects of the application).

Claim 4:

Faustini discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said step of executing sequentially the plurality of components includes the steps of:

- retrieving, in sequence, each component of the plurality of components (see Figure 16; see Column 89, Line 10 through Column 99, Line 32 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the web application, displayed in Figure 16, "retrieves sequentially" each component of the application in order to display the appropriate Centigrade/Fahrenheit relationship, as explained in the cited figure and text);
- interpreting, in sequence, with a corresponding interpreter on the at least one server, each retrieved component (see Figures 1-2; see Column 7, Line 21 through Column 10, Line 31 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming system includes the Java programming language; systems running Java applications include an interpreter, as indicated in the cited text; as indicated in the above rejection of Claim 1, the application is "executed sequentially," and thus each component of the application is "interpreted sequentially"); and
- evaluating, in sequence, on the at least one server, each interpreted component (see Figure 16; see Column 89, Line 10 through Column 99, Line 32 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the web application, displayed in Figure 16, "evaluates sequentially" each component of the application in order to display the

appropriate Centigrade/Fahrenheit relationship, as explained in the cited figure and text).

Claim 5

Faustini discloses the method of Claim 4, wherein the at least one server comprises an application server storing the transferred web application and at least one web server (as indicated previously, Faustini discloses an object oriented programming system for use in creating scripts to be included into web pages; these web pages are dynamic, meaning that the components of a web page are assembled upon the user's request of said web page; this implies that the web application is on one server and other components of the web page are on other servers; thus, Faustini discloses both an "application server" and a "web server") and said step of executing sequentially the plurality of components includes the further steps of:

- receiving at the at least one web server the request from the user on the computer network for the web application (Faustini discloses a computer network that is part of the Internet; thus, Faustini discloses "receiving, at the web server, the request for the web application from the user;" this limitation simply describes a user using the Internet to request a dynamic web page that includes a script);
- transferring the request from the at least one web server to the application server storing the web application (Faustini discloses scripts that are parts of dynamic web pages on the Internet; thus, Faustini discloses "transferring the request from

the web server to the application server;" this limitation simply describes a user using the Internet to request a dynamic web page that includes a script);

- retrieving, interpreting and evaluating on the application server each component of the web application (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 4, Faustini discloses this limitation);
- transferring output for the user generated from the evaluation of the plurality of components of the web application to the at least one web server (see Column 8, Line 24 through Column 9, Line 2; see Column 100, Lines 22-64 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that it discloses web applications that execute on the server); and
- communicating the output for the user over the computer network to the user with the at least one web server (Faustini discloses this limitation in that it discloses web applications that execute on the server; server-side scripts execute the script at the server and transfer the output to the appropriate web server).

Claim 6:

Faustini discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said step of transferring the web application to at least one server further includes the steps of:

- retrieving all files associated with the web application and the plurality of components created during generation of the web application (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation, as shown in the figures and the cited text; the "files" are the objects

making up the application; the objects are "retrieved" before they are "transfer to the server" in that they are gathered during creation of the application);

- combining the retrieved files associated with the web application and the plurality of components into a single file (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation, as shown in the figures and the cited text; objects are "combined" "into a single file" in that they are interconnected to form the application; additionally, object oriented programming in the Java language involves a compiler, which ***inherently*** "combines the files associated with the application into a single file");
- selecting a server from the at least one server to receive the combined file (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming system includes applications running on a client/server computer network; the applications are included in web pages that reside on servers; thus, the creator of each application "selected a server" to "receive" the application);
- verifying authority to transfer the combined file to the selected server (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – the figures and the cited text disclose "verifying authority to transfer the combined file"); and
- deploying the combined file to the selected server (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming system includes applications running on a

client/server computer network; thus, the creator of each application "deploys" the application to a "selected" server).

Claim 7:

Faustini discloses the method of Claim 1, further comprising the step of testing the web application and the plurality of components for errors before said step of transferring the web application to at least one server (see Figures 6-17; see Column 69, Line 64 through Column 70, Line 58 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming system is "live" and thus "tests" the application as it is being developed and before it is placed onto a server).

Claim 8:

Faustini discloses a system to develop web applications and to execute the developed web applications on a computer network (see Figures 4A-D; see Column 59, Line 53 through Column 60, Line 39 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming tool is used to create scripts for web pages), the system comprising:

- at least one development computer, said at least one development computer being used by an author to generate a web application and said at least one development computer further comprising an authoring tool (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that that the object oriented programming includes a "development

computer," as shown in Figure 1, that is used to develop web applications, as explained in the above rejection of Claim 1; thus, Faustini discloses a "development computer" that includes an "authoring tool" that is used to "generate a web application");

- at least one storage device to store said web application generated by said author (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7, Faustini discloses servers that hold the web applications created by the authors);
- said authoring tool further comprising means for visually generating in a single visual workspace both decision logic and a visual layout of said web application using a plurality of components (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Faustini discloses this limitation; more specifically, see the rationale for the rejection of the "visually generating" step of Claim 1) and said authoring tool including means for transferring said web application from said at least one development computer to said at least one storage device (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 6, Faustini discloses this limitation; more specifically, see the rationale for the rejection of the "transferring" step of Claim 1 and the rationale for the rejection of every step in Claim 6); and
- at least one server communicating with said authoring tool, said at least one server comprising means for providing access to said web application stored in said at least one storage device to users on a computer network and said at least one sever comprising means for directly executing said plurality of components of said web application in response to a request from a user on said computer

network for access to said web application (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Faustini discloses a server that "communicates with" the object oriented programming tool; the server "provides access" to the web application in that it is part of the Internet used by those who wish to use the web application; as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Faustini discloses that the web application "directly executes" the components of the application in order to display the appropriate Centigrade/Fahrenheit relationship).

Claim 9:

Faustini discloses the system of Claim 8, wherein said means for directly executing said plurality of components comprises an interpreter to interpret and execute each component of said plurality of components of said web application (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 4, Faustini discloses an interpreter that "interprets and executes" the components of the web application).

Claim 10:

Faustini discloses the system of Claim 8, wherein:

- said means for directly executing said plurality of components of said web application further comprises means for initializing and executing an instance of said web application for each user on said computer network requesting access to said web application (the web application disclosed in Faustini comprises a means for "initializing and executing" an instance of the web application to each

user that requests access to the application in that, upon a user loading the web page that includes the web application, the application starts to run and runs to completion); and

- said at least one server comprises means for maintaining and monitoring a state of each instance of said web application initialized and executed for a user on said computer network (see Column 5, Lines 19-47 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the web application "maintains and monitors" a state of the components of the application, as indicated in the cited text).

Claim 11:

Faustini discloses the system of Claim 8, wherein:

- said plurality of components comprises a plurality of nodes (Faustini discloses this limitation in that the components of the web application are interconnected and are thus "nodes");
- each node of said plurality of nodes accomplishing a particular function in a web application (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Faustini discloses this limitation); and
- said means for visually generating in a single visual workspace both decision logic and a visual layout of said web application comprises means for interconnecting nodes of said plurality of nodes in said visual workspace to generate said decision logic of said web application (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Faustini discloses this limitation).

Claim 12:

Faustini discloses the system of Claim 11, wherein said means for visually generating in a single visual workspace both decision logic and a visual layout of said web application further comprises for each node of said plurality of nodes a corresponding means for customizing said particular function accomplished by said node to said web application (see Column 10, Lines 52-59 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming system allows the user to customize each component of the web application).

Claim 13:

Faustini discloses the system of Claim 12, wherein:

- said plurality of nodes comprises a first node to accomplish receiving inputs from a user and a second node to accomplish displaying outputs to a user (see Column 70, Lines 25-40 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming system provides an editor for each component; as the component is edited, the "visual layout" of the web application is adjusted in the "Project Studio Desktop" window);
- said means for customizing said first node comprises means for generating a visual layout to receive inputs from a user (Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming system provides an editor that includes a GUI into which a user can input data); and

- said means for customizing said second node comprises means for generating a visual layout to display outputs to a user (as indicated in the above discussion, as the component is edited, the "visual layout" of the web application is adjusted in the "Project Studio Desktop" window).

Claim 14:

Faustini discloses the system of Claim 8, wherein:

- said at least one server comprises at least one application server and at least one web server communicating with said at least one application server (as indicated previously, discloses an object oriented programming system for use in creating web applications to be included into web pages; these web pages are dynamic, meaning that the components of a web page are assembled upon the user's request of said web page; this implies that the web application is on one server and other components of the web page are on another server; thus, Faustini discloses an "application server" and a "web server" that communicates with said application server);
- said at least one application server comprises said means for directly executing said plurality of components in said at least one storage device (Faustini discloses this limitation in that the web application contains all of the components and is located at the server; as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Faustini discloses that the web application "directly executes" the components of the application); and

- said at least one web server comprises said means for providing access to said web application (Faustini discloses this limitation in that the user accesses the web page that includes the web application via the Internet, to which the web server is connected).

Claim 15:

Faustini discloses the system of Claim 8, wherein:

- said computer network comprises one of Intranet, Extranet and Internet (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 8, Faustini discloses this limitation);
- said means for providing access to said web application comprises a HTTP server (see Column 100, Lines 22-45 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming system includes applications on a HTTP server);
- said means for visually generating in a single visual workspace both decision logic and a visual layout of said web application comprises means for storing information relating to said web application in a plurality of files (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation, as shown in the figures and the cited text; the "information" are the objects making up the application; the objects are "stored" at the server, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1);
- said means for transferring said web application comprises means for combining and compressing said information relating to said web application in said plurality

of files into a single file (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation, as shown in the figures and the cited text; objects are "combined and compressed" "into a single file" in that they are interconnected to form the application; additionally, object oriented programming in the Java language involves a compiler, which ***inherently*** "combines and compresses the information relating to said web application into a single file"); and

- said means for transferring said web application comprises means for selecting said at least one server (see Figures 5-17; see Column 69, Line 23 through Column 99, Line 47 – Faustini discloses this limitation in that the object oriented programming system includes applications running on a client/server computer network; the applications are included in web pages that reside on servers; thus, the creator of each application "selected a server" to "receive" the application).

Claims 16-20:

These claims merely recite computer software that performs the methods of Claims 1-7. More specifically, the limitations of Claim 16 are found in Claim 1, the limitations of Claim 17 are found in Claims 2 and 3, the limitations of Claim 18 are found in Claims 4 and 5, the limitations of Claim 19 are found in Claim 6, and the limitations of Claim 20 are found in Claim 7.

Thus, Faustini discloses every limitation of these claims using the same rationale set forth in the above rejections for Claims 1-7.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 26 July 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's Arguments for Claims 1, 8 and 16:

Applicant argues that Faustini fails to disclose a "single visual workspace" in which a user generates both "decision logic" and a "visual layout" of a web application because Faustini has two workspaces – the document view for developing decision logic and the physical view for developing the visual layout. See *Applicant's Response*; Page 13, last paragraph.

Examiner disagrees.

It appears that the Applicant is interpreting the "single visual workspace" of the present invention to be element 200 in Figure 2. This corresponds with the Specification (see Page 8, Line 16 through Page 9, Line 8). From this part of the Specification, the examiner interprets the "visual layout" of the web application to be the interconnection of nodes that controls the "structure" of the web application. That is, the "visual layout" is essentially a flowchart of the web application. Such a "single visual workspace" directly corresponds to the "Project Studio Desktop" in Faustini.

In Figure 16 of Faustini, the "Project Studio Desktop" allows the user to visually generate both "decision logic" and a "visual layout" of a web application. The "Project Studio Desktop" visually displays both: 1) the components ("decision logic") comprising the web application as icons; and 2) the interrelationships ("visual layout") between the

various components to show the sequence in which the components are executed. Also, the object oriented programming tool in Faustini allows the user to select both the components ("decision logic") of the web application and the interrelationships between those components using the "Project Studio Desktop." Thus, the "Project Studio Desktop" visually generates in a single visual workspace both decision logic and a visual layout for a web application, as recited in Claims 1, 8 and 16.

Applicant supports its argument by pointing out that the "visual layout" of Faustini is shown in the "physical view" (see element 500 in Figure 5). In its analysis of Faustini, Applicant gives the phrase "visual layout" an entirely new meaning. In the physical view, the object oriented programming tool of Faustini allows the user to observe how the web application would be displayed in a web page browser. However, as pointed out in the previous discussion, Faustini includes the "Project Studio Desktop," which is a single visual workspace in which both decision logic and a visual layout for a web application are visually generated by the user.

Applicant argues that Faustini fails to disclose "executing sequentially" the components of the web application because Faustini does not provide any details as to how the components generated in the object oriented programming tool are executed once they are assembled. See *Applicant's Response*; Page 14, first full paragraph.

Examiner disagrees.

Applicant particularly points out that it fails to understand how a developed web application, said web application comprising components that are interconnected, can

teach "sequential execution." The relevant language of the claims reads: "executing sequentially the components of the web application" (see Claim 1, Lines 15-16). This language is extremely broad.

The interconnections between the components of the web application in Faustini (see Figure 16) disclose the "sequence" of "execution" of the web application. Moreover, ***any*** web application comprising components ***inherently*** "executes sequentially." Thus, the object oriented programming tool of Faustini allows the user to build a web application by selecting components and interconnecting those components to "execute sequentially" when the web application is loaded into a dynamic web page.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (703) 305-1701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

WDH
October 12, 2004

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER